



MEMO TO: NSERC APPLICANT

You will find enclosed a Message to Applicant prepared by the Evaluation Group (EG) that reviewed your Discovery Grant application. This message represents the consensus opinion of the evaluation group.

You will also find enclosed copies of the external referee reports received regarding your application. You should note that:

- Referee reports are only one of a number of factors taken into consideration by the EG. External referees review applications in isolation, and not in the context of a severe competition for limited funds. The opinions expressed therein are those of the referees – they do not necessarily reflect the views of the EG.
- Some referees do not respond in time for their reports to be used by the evaluation group. In such cases, a note to this effect will appear on the report. Although late reports were not used, they are enclosed for your information as they may contain useful advice.
- The names of the referees and any reference to a third party have been removed from the reports in accordance with the federal *Privacy Act*.

If the referee reports were not prepared in the official language of your choice (for correspondence), NSERC would be pleased to translate them on request.

You may consult the instructions given to the external referees which can be found on the NSERC website at <http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/OnlineServices-ServicesEnLigne/instructions/140/e.asp?prog=dg>.

We hope that you will find this information helpful.

Research Grants Division
March 2013

NOTE AU : CANDIDAT DU CRSNG

Vous trouverez ci-joint un Message au candidat préparé par le groupe d'évaluation (GE) qui a évalué votre demande de subvention à la découverte. Ce message reflète le consensus de l'opinion du groupe d'évaluation.

De plus, vous trouverez ci-joint une copie des rapports d'examineurs de l'extérieur portant sur votre demande. Veuillez noter que :

- ces rapports ne représentent qu'une partie des facteurs dont tient compte le GE dans l'élaboration de ses recommandations. Les examinateurs évaluent les demandes isolément et non dans le contexte d'un concours pour des fonds limités. Il est important de noter que les opinions exprimées dans ces rapports sont celles des examinateurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement celles du groupe d'évaluation.
- les rapports de certains examinateurs qui ont répondu trop tard n'ont pu être utilisés par le groupe d'évaluation. Lorsque tel est le cas, le rapport porte une note à cet effet. Néanmoins, nous vous faisons aussi parvenir ces rapports, car ils peuvent contenir des conseils utiles.
- le nom des examinateurs de même que toute référence à une tierce personne ont été enlevés conformément à la Loi fédérale sur la protection des renseignements personnels.

Si les rapports d'examineurs de l'extérieur ont été préparés dans la langue autre que celle de votre choix (pour la correspondance), le CRSNG se fera un plaisir de vous les traduire sur demande.

Vous pouvez consulter les instructions qui sont données aux examinateurs de l'extérieur et qui se trouvent dans le site web du CRSNG (<http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/OnlineServices-ServicesEnLigne/instructions/140/f.asp?prog=dg>).

Nous espérons que ces renseignements sauront vous être utiles.

La Division des subventions de recherche
Mars 2013



MESSAGE TO APPLICANT

MESSAGE AU CANDIDAT

This message represents the consensus opinion of the Evaluation Group that reviewed your application.

Ce message reflète le consensus de l'opinion du Groupe d'évaluation qui a examiné votre demande.

Applicant's Name, Appl. ID, Institution / Nom de famille, numéro de la demande, établissement du candidat	Bar-Natan, Dror D, 262178-2013, Toronto
Type of Grant / Genre de subvention	Discovery Grants Program - Individual Programme de subventions à la découverte - individuelles
Evaluation Group / Groupe d'évaluation	Mathematics and Statistics Mathématiques et statistique
Application Title / Titre de la demande	Knot Theory, Algebra, and Higher Algebra

The Evaluation Group rated your application as follows / Le Groupe d'évaluation a attribué les cotes suivantes à votre demande de subvention :

Excellence of the Researcher(s) / Excellence du ou des chercheurs :	Strong
---	--------

The Evaluation Group (EG) assessed the applicant's contributions to the Natural Sciences and Engineering (NSE) in the context of the applicant's research community based on a number of elements including the applicant's knowledge, expertise and experience, the applicant's stature in the field as well as the quality and impact of the research accomplishments over the past six years. Although the referee comments were very positive about the applicant's overall mathematical contribution throughout his career, the EG's decision to give a rating of "Strong" for Excellence of Researcher was based on the limited publication of peer-reviewed articles over the last 6 years.

Merit of the Proposal / Mérite de la proposition :	Outstanding
--	-------------

The Evaluation Group assessed a number of components such as (i) originality and innovation of the proposed research; (ii) significance and expected contributions to research; (iii) clarity and scope of objectives; (iv) clarity and appropriateness of methodology; (v) feasibility of the research plan; (vi) appropriateness of, and justification for, the budget. In this regard, the EG was very impressed with the research program described by the applicant and truly hopes the applicant will produce deep and published mathematics over the course of the next 5 years.

Training of Highly Qualified Personnel / Formation de personnel hautement qualifié :	Outstanding
--	-------------

Cost of Research / Coût de la recherche :	Normal
---	--------

Additional Comments / Commentaires additionnels :

In the 2013 competition, the Mathematics and Statistics Evaluation Group evaluated a total of 288 Discovery Grants applications. NSERC Discovery Grants applications are assessed by Evaluation Group members according to peer review guidelines of the NSERC's Peer Review Manual. A copy of the NSERC's Peer Review Manual can be found on NSERC Website.

In some aspects, the applicant might find that external referee reports appear to be inconsistent with the comments and/or recommendations made by the Evaluation Group. To understand this, one must take into account the fact that external referees read a maximum of three (3) NSERC proposals in a given year; most often, they read only one. Consequently, they cannot have the same comparative view as that of Evaluation Group members, who each read and evaluate on average 50 applications.

DISCOVERY GRANTS MERIT INDICATORS¹

	Exceptional	Outstanding	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Insufficient
Excellence of the Researcher	Acknowledged as a leader who has continued to make, over the last six years, influential accomplishments at the highest level of quality, impact and/or importance to a broad community.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be far superior in quality, impact and/or importance to a broad community.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be of superior quality, impact and/or importance.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be solid in their quality, impact and/or importance.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be of reasonable quality, impact and/or importance.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be below an acceptable level of quality, impact and/or importance.
Merit of the Proposal	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is extremely original and innovative and is likely to have impact by leading to groundbreaking advances in the area and/or leading to a technology or policy that addresses socio-economic or environmental needs. Long-term vision and short-term objectives are clearly defined. The methodology is clearly defined and appropriate. The budget clearly demonstrates how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is highly original and innovative and is likely to have impact by contributing to groundbreaking advances in the area, and/or leading to a technology or policy that addresses socio-economic or environmental needs. Long-term goals are clearly defined and short-term objectives are well planned. The methodology is clearly described and appropriate. The budget clearly demonstrates how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is original and innovative and is likely to have impact by leading to advancements and/or addressing socio-economic or environmental needs. Long-term goals are defined and short-term objectives are planned. The methodology is clearly described and appropriate. The budget demonstrates how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is original and innovative and is likely to have impact and/or address environmental needs. Long-term goals and short-term objectives are clearly described and appropriate. The methodology is described and appropriate. The budget demonstrates how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, has original and innovative aspects and may have impact and/or address socio-economic or environmental needs. Long-term objectives are partially described and/or appropriate. The budget demonstrates how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program, as presented lacks clarity , and/or is of limited originality and innovation. Objectives are not clearly described and/or likely not attainable. Methodology is not clearly described and/or appropriate. The budget does not clearly demonstrate how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.
Training of HQP	Training record is at the highest level with HQP contributing to top quality research. Most HQP move on to positions that require highly desired skills , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are appropriate and clearly defined. HQP success highly likely.	Training record is far superior to other applicants, with HQP contributing to high-quality research. Most HQP move on to positions that require highly desired skills , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are appropriate and clearly defined. HQP success highly likely.	Training record is superior to other applicants, with HQP contributing to quality, original research. Many HQP move on to appropriate positions that require desired skills , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are appropriate and clearly described. HQP success is likely.	Training record compares favourably with other applicants. HQP generally move on to positions that require desired skills , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are appropriate and described. HQP success is likely.	Training record is acceptable but may be modest relative to other applicants. Some HQP move on to programs or positions that require desired skills , obtained through training received. Plans for trainees are described and should contribute to HQP success.	Training record is below an acceptable level relative to other applicants. HQP do not, in general, move on to positions that require skills obtained through training received. Plans for trainees are not appropriate or are not described with enough information to predict likelihood of HQP success.

¹The Discovery Grants Merit Indicators should be used in conjunction with the Peer Review Manual (Chapter 6) which outlines how reviewers arrive at a rating.

Cost of Research²	High	Normal	Low
	Majority of justified expenses represent costs higher than the norm for the research area.	Majority of justified expenses are within the norm for the research area.	Majority of justified expenses are lower than the norm for the research area.

² Possible examples include: Cost of training of HQP; Equipment intensive research and/or high users fees; particularly expensive or frequent consumables; Travel (for collaborations, field work, access to facilities, conferences, ...)